

American Opinion Summary

Department of State

Permanent file copy

Do not remove.

No. 110

November 1, 1962

1. Russia and Cuba
2. India-China Conflict

1. RUSSIA AND CUBA

Concern about the progress and results of the liquidation of the Cuban crisis is reflected in comment from a number of sources.

We "would do well to continue to keep Cuba under the closest surveillance" until "the cards are turned face up on the table in full view of the U.N. mediators," the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette suggests.

The possibility of trouble with Castro is noted. The New York Herald Tribune warns that "the expansionist, subversive aims of the Cuban based Communists," remain. The Washington Post says that Castro "can be expected to do all that he can to blot the news of his humiliation with terror elsewhere." Scripps-Howard's Washington News warns that Castro and his system are a continuing menace and expresses hope that Latin Americans realize this.

With reference to Castro's demands to U Thant, the New York Times declares that "Premier Khrushchev will expose himself to a charge of bad faith unless he promptly inform his Cuban friend to cease interference."

The President's assurance of just invasion of Cuba is one source of concern. The Cincinnati Enquirer says that if Khrushchev withdraws his missiles, "Cuba will continue to serve as a Soviet outpost in the Western Hemisphere," now with the "solemn assurance" of the President "that there will be no military action to interrupt its work of fomenting revolution throughout Latin America." Arthur Krock lists "the unconditional language of Mr. Kennedy's pledge to forgo an invasion of the island" as a source of "current anxiety."

The Enquirer adds that if negotiation results in "the abandonment of American bases somewhere on the fringe of the Soviet empire the United States will have tantalized a new I.O.U."

The value of the UN has been demonstrated, the Boston Herald and Providence Journal hold. Both Premier Khrushchev and President Kennedy kept the Secretary General "informed of their moves, and when agreement was reached they availed themselves of the machinery of the UN to implement it," the Boston Herald comments. The Providence Journal says that the UN's function "became one not of enforcing peace, but of facilitating it by means of conciliation and mediation."

RUSSIA AND CUBA
(Contd.)

But Arthur Krock suggests that Americans make certain that the UN "remains the agent and not the revisionist" of U.S. policy. Hearst's New York Journal-American asserts: "To turn over reconnaissance to the UN is unthinkable."

2. INDIA-CHINA CONFLICT

The U.S. decision to supply defense assistance to India wins strong approval. "It was well understood that America--as well as Britain and her Commonwealth associates--would have to rally to India's defense if India was to be defended" from the invading Red Chinese at all, says the Philadelphia Inquirer. Similarly, the Boston Herald contends "there was never any doubt that the U.S. would give India full military aid against China, if asked."

"There has been no haggling over the financial terms," Walter Lippmann observes, and, "quite wisely, we are not asking the Indians for any kind of formal agreement which might drive the Soviet into still more explicit support of the Chinese aggression." Earlier comment also tended to anticipate the action approvingly (e.g., Milwaukee Journal, Wash. Star, Phila. Bulletin, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Max Lerner).

But the Chicago Tribune opposed "dabbling in" what is not clearly "anything more than a border skirmish," arguing that "we have our hands full of troubles" on this side of the world.

The displacement of Krishna Menon as Defense Minister is warmly applauded. At a moment when India needed help, Menon has become "much worse than useless," the Baltimore Sun asserts, and his removal "will strengthen India's growing spirit of national unity and determination."

India should next effect an accord with Pakistan, in the interest of their mutual defense against the Chinese danger, several declare. Menon's "baleful influence on Kashmir negotiations," says the Philadelphia Inquirer, "is something that might also now be removed to the benefit of all concerned. It is high time for India and Pakistan to realize that the real enemy of both is Red China" (similarly, N.Y. Times).

Robert H. Estabrook feels "it would mean a great deal now if India could withdraw one or two divisions confronting Pakistan and send them to the Chinese border" (in Wash. Post). There is "no time to solve the Kashmir problem before the defense of India is secured," adds Walter Lippmann, therefore "it is highly important that some kind of military standstill on Kashmir be arranged." Scripps-Howard's Washington News suggests "it is an opportune time for Washington and London to impress" on both India and Pakistan the "meaning" of the Red Chinese drive, "and perhaps bring a new agreement between the two."